

3540

RECORD
COPY

mas

REF: 3540

14 July 1960

MAIN FILE

CRITICISM OF THE "NEWEST" BOURGEOIS
EDUCATIONAL THEORIES

- USSR -

RETURN TO MAIN FILE

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A
Approved for Public Release
Distribution Unlimited

19991008 143

Photocopies of this report may be purchased from:

PHOTOCOPIATION SERVICE
LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
WASHINGTON 25, D. C.

Reproduced From
Best Available Copy

U. S. JOINT PUBLICATIONS RESEARCH SERVICE
205 EAST 42nd STREET, SUITE 300
NEW YORK 17, N. Y.

ATTENTION TO THE
SPECIALTY OF THE
BANKING BUSINESS

JPRS: 3540

CSO: 3774LD

CRITICISM OF THE "NEWEST" BOURGEOIS
EDUCATIONAL THEORIES

- USSR -

	<u>Page</u>
Table of Contents	
Reaction in Politics and in Education	1
The Individual Character of Bourgeois Educational Theories	9
The Myth of Transforming Society Through Education	16
The Role of the School in Creating a Workers' Aristocracy	19
The School as a Means of "Smoothing Over" Class Contradictions	12
The School as a Tool of Bourgeois Influence on Workers' Children	23
The Struggle Against Science, Against Arming the Workers with Scientific Knowledge	25
Two Cultures in Class Society, Two Lines in Education	31
Utilization of the School to Strengthen the Class Division of Society	11

CRITICISM OF THE "NEWEST" BOURGEOIS EDUCATIONAL THEORIES - USSR -

[Following is a translation of M. S. Bernshteyn's Russian-language brochure Kritika "noveyshikh" burzhuaznykh pedagogicheskikh teoriy (Criticism of the "Newest" Bourgeois Educational Theories). This brochure is No. 20 of the series published by the All-Union Society for the Dissemination of Political and Scientific Knowledge, Moscow, 1959, pages 3-32.]

Reaction in Politics and in Education

The change from bourgeois democracy to political reaction is characteristic for the modern imperialist stage of the development of capitalism.

Reaction in the field of politics naturally brings with it reaction in all fields of ideology--in philosophy, science, and art.

Modern "educational philosophies," or more simply, modern bourgeois educational theories, are as one with bourgeois ideology: they are nurtured by the same class roots and try to resolve the tasks set for them in accordance with the social orders of the ruling classes.

The extensive and complex education-theory literature of the leading capitalist countries might at first glance create the impression that we are seeing a revival of bourgeois theoretical thought.

Actually, however, this abundance and complexity of educational theories, for which new intricate and intriguing names and tags are thought up, shows the great lack of coordination and great disorder in the camp of bourgeois education.

In spite of the great complexity of their argumentation and verbal formalization of their positions, all bourgeois educational theories are alike in their basic intentions, and all the theoretical "disputes" between them are of a primarily terminological character. There is more to unite them than disunite them. Their theoretical disputes at best reflect the in-

terests and concepts of the various strata within the bourgeoisie itself.

One of the characteristics of imperialism is the steady conversion of the bourgeois school into a tool of bourgeois influence on the masses, into a "defender against revolution." All bourgeois educational theories are therefore first and foremost alike in the struggle against the ideology of the proletariat, summoned by the historical development of society to become the grave-digger of capitalism. All bourgeois educational theories are openly against Marxism-Leninism generally and against Marxist-Leninist education in particular.

For example, in the voluminous collective work Modern Philosophy and Education, published in the US in 1955, one of the authors, Robert Cohen, a lecturer in philosophy and physics, states that "Marxist thought challenges us (i.e., bourgeois ideologists -- M. B.) more than Soviet armed strength."

The essence of this challenge and the magnitude of its danger for bourgeois ideology was shown by the other author of the same work, John Wilde, professor of philosophy at Harvard University:

"Academic philosophy (i.e., the philosophy taught in American higher educational institutions -- M. B.) has turned into a desert waste. It has little relation to life and is not particularly attractive except to careerists and narrow specialists.

"It is not surprising that many of our searching young people in this time of chaos and spiritual repression have turned to Marxism. They have been offered no alternative. Our philosophy no longer fulfills the work expected of it in the past."

Each of the authors of this collective work tries, insofar as he can, to throw stones at Marxist education or at least somehow to discredit this teaching which is attracting more and more the attention and sympathy of broad strata of ordinary workers in education throughout the world.

According to the laws of the United States, not only is the objective exposition of the teachings of Marx forbidden in American educational institutions, but all Communists and their "fellow-travelers," i.e., all progressive-thinking teachers, are forbidden to work in them.

The bourgeois educational theorists, like all bourgeois

theorists in general, are fleeing more and more to all the irrational and openly religious teachings, seeking in them additional arguments against dialectical materialism.

For example, in the prospectus for the book The Challenge of Existentialism, by the same professor John Wilde, it is emphasized that "in the critical exposition of Wilde existentialism could become a dynamic philosophy, so necessary for unity against the attractiveness of the systematic thinking of Marxism". (see Note)

Note: Existentialism (from the Latin word existentio -- existence) is a variety of modern subjective idealism. This philosophy considers as primary "existence", "the personal spiritual life of each individual person", and contrasts these to life and objective reality. Its characteristics are spiritual barrenness, fear of the future, black pessimism, hostility toward science, and hatred of the masses.)

First violin in the modern orchestra of bourgeois educational theories, beside existentialism, is played by the Neo-Thomists, i.e., the modern followers of the Middle Ages scholasticism of Thomas Aquinas, officially taken as the ideological armament of the supreme command of Catholicism -- the Vatican.

Neo-Thomist "philosophy" has long occupied a ruling position in the Romance countries of Western Europe and in the countries of South America. After the economic crisis of 1929-33 in the capitalist countries, Neo-Thomist philosophy and education considerably strengthened their influence even in such countries as the United States, England, and Germany, which were earlier primarily Protestant countries.

Representatives of other faiths are trying to strengthen their influence on popular education, as well as on education organized by the government.

Without exception, all modern bourgeois educational theories are alike in their striving for a religious education for the young generations.

Symptomatic in this respect, is the position of the authors of the book Modern Philosophy and Education (published in 1955, in which are set forth about a dozen various educational theories. The editor and compiler of this edition, professor John Brubecher of Yale University, asked each of the authors to write an article on the six "cardinal" questions relating to education.

The sixth question asks: "Is there the danger that the school, in its fervent attempt to avoid sectarianism, is fully ignoring religion and becoming too (? -- M. B.) secular?"

It goes without saying that all the authors, in presenting various educational theories, beginning with the militant-religious (which, by the way, are in the majority in the compilation) and ending with the theories using so-called scientific terminology and pretending to be scientific, give religion a leading place in their concepts of education.

The return of the bourgeois educational thought of the twentieth century "back to Thomism" expresses the union with the Papacy characteristic of the bourgeoisie.

The political meaning of this irrespressible attraction of the bourgeoisie to religion was shown by V. I. Lenin in 1911.

"It is not by chance," wrote V. I. Lenin, "but by necessity that all reaction in general, liberal reaction in particular, has "thrown itself" on religion. One lash, one whip is little; the lash is nonetheless broken" (V. I. Lenin, Soch. (Collected Works), Volume 17, page 54).

The cornerstone of the "newest" bourgeois educational theories of Neo-Thomism, existentialism, personalism (see Note following), and other openly religious theories is the proposition of the godly extraction of man, the emphasis on his "sinful fall."

Note: Personalism -- from the Latin word persona, meaning "person." Personalism is a reactionary religiophilosophic trend which considers the "person" as primary. According to this teaching, God is the supreme person, possessing reason and will, man having been created "in the image and likeness of God." To the teaching of the revolutionary transformation of society, the personalists contrast the spiritual perfecting and moral rebirth of each human being, with the inviolability of the capitalist system of relations.)

The idea of the godly extraction of man and the world is used by the bourgeois theoreticians of education to show the "stability," "permanence," and "wisdom" of the existing capitalist system, to surround the power of the wealthy with a halo of sanctity and inviolability.

And so that the broad masses may not "become conceited" because this "godliness" extends to them, the churchmen instill

in them the thought that because of the fall of their forebears, people have been deprived of this godliness on the sinful earth, which has become for them a vale of tears.

By means of this teaching of the fall and the "lost" godliness, the religionists try to keep the masses in permanent fear, meekness, and submissiveness.

"Religion is one of the forms of the spiritual yoke borne everywhere by the masses oppressed by eternal work for others, by want and loneliness... Him who works and wants his whole life long religion teaches meekness and patience in this earthly life, consoling him with the hope of heavenly reward. And those who live by the labor of others religion teaches philanthropy in this earthly life, offering them a very cheap justification for their whole exploiters' existence, and selling at reduced prices tickets to heavenly well-being" (V. I. Lenin, Soch., Vol. 10, pp. 65-66).

To provide the exploiters with the opportunity to "eat fully, sleep soundly, and live merrily" (Lenin), their church executors-of-wills try to keep the masses in check, to dull their class feelings, to educate them in a spirit of obedience. To the political lash the churchmen add fear: fear of the law, fear of the power of the wealthy, and above all fear of the all-seeing and chastising God and Church. In the name of religion, the bourgeois theoreticians of education toss overboard one of the main achievements of the state school -- its secularity.

The unalterable fact is the rejection by the bourgeois state of its position of separation of the school from the church, which the bourgeoisie itself defended in the period of its struggle with feudalism.

The modern princes of the church are no longer satisfied with the network of religious schools created by them and not only maintained but even expanded during the second half of the nineteenth and first half of the twentieth centuries. Now they ask the government for subsidies for their church schools, and for free access for priests into the state schools themselves! Never before in the history of capitalism has the attack of the church on the school been so strong and so insistent as in our day!

The true state of affairs was expressed by Beals, one of the English advocates of religious education.

Expressing his satisfaction with the fact that the Education Act of 1944, according to which the English school system now functions, legalized a daily prayer in all the state schools of England, Beals emphasizes: "The main thing is that this violates established tradition: the state is no longer neutral in questions of religious education. It has come out on the side of Christianity..."

We may proudly state that the Soviet school is consistently a secular school, giving its students original scientific knowledge freed from all mysticism and superstition, built on the firm foundation of dialectical materialism.

How far modern bourgeoisie has departed from its own ideals, how unceremoniously it changes its own former slogans, can also be seen in the metamorphosis which has occurred with the notorious slogan of the bourgeoisie: "freedom of education."

As is known, during the struggle with feudalism and the papacy, this slogan of freedom of education from religion expressed the demands of the young, then revolutionary, bourgeoisie to free education from the wardship and control of the church.

At the present time this slogan has been taken over by the churchmen themselves, and under the banner of "freedom of education" they extract from the bourgeois state the freedom for religion to build its own schools, not only independently of state control but also fully at the expense of the state.

Under this slogan the church reaction is coming forward not only in France, but in many other countries of the capitalist world. Since 1950 there has existed under this slogan the international "Union for the Freedom of Education," which joins the more aggressive partisans of religious education of the 14 countries of the so-called "Western world." Religion has become the main ideological stronghold of imperialism, as it was in its time for serfdom.

As is known, the separation of the school from the church and the creation of the state school was an act of the bourgeoisie itself, and doubtless was one of the progressive actions of early capitalism. Thus also were created the well-known prerequisites for satisfying the educational needs not only of the chosen minority, as was the case in the pre-capitalist era, but also of the children of the workers. But from the first days of its coming into power the bourgeoisie has not only kept for itself the right to create a network of private schools, actually independent of the state, it has also made use of the

opportunities and means of the state itself for creating two parallel school systems: one for the children of the wealthy classes, the other for the "children of the people."

Thus the bourgeoisie provided for itself special privileges in the field of education in general and almost a full monopoly in secondary and higher education.

However, even with this class limitation of the state school in capitalism, the state school may still satisfy the known educational needs of the workers. If the people continually pressure the legislative organs of the state, they can make the bourgeoisie make certain concessions in the field of education. It is precisely this that explains the fact that the working masses have defended and continue to defend the principle of state direction and control in the field of public education, beginning with the elementary school and finishing with the higher institutions.

But the modern bourgeois educational theories consider to be cramping for themselves the state framework which is supposed to be comfortable for the bourgeoisie.

This in the first place relates to the more reactionary theories, such as Neo-Thomist education, as well as the so-called personalist education.

The Vatican set forth its educational platform in detail in a special encyclical of Pope Pius XI, published on the eve of 1930.

The encyclical of Pius XI names three claimants to the education of the younger generations. Two of them -- the family and the state -- are placed in the lower ("natural") order, and the third -- the church -- in the higher ("supernatural") order.

The encyclical directly emphasizes the "independence of the church from all earthly power in its role of 'educator' not only in relation to its special aims but also with respect to the means for achieving these aims."

The encyclical calls "unjust and illegal" any monopoly of the state in the field of the organization of education, calling just as unjust and illegal the use of state schools for the education of children in a spirit "contrary to the Christian conscience of the parents and to the commands of the church."

Translating these propositions of the encyclical into generally understood political language, one of the leading Neo-Thomist educators, William MacHogen, wages an open attack on "democracy," which has become "a dogma of total power for the people," "a dogma of majority rule," against "democracy, which has become absolute."

He mockingly comments on the ability of the masses to direct the state, and fights for all kinds of limitation of the already-reduced bourgeois democracy in the field of education.

Representatives of personalist education speak out openly against bourgeois democracy in the field of education. They call democracy "the tyranny of the former unprivileged." To the "democracy of quantity" they contrast their "democracy of quality." The leader of the personalists, Fluelling, cynically says that "we vainly imagine that equality in the distribution of wealth, privileges, or education leads to a renovation of society."

The English conservatives speak against the full subordination of education to the state with a somewhat different motivation. It is not by chance that to this day in England there is law requiring parents to send their children to school. The English have the right to personally teach their children at home, hire private teachers for them, send them to private closed schools, free from any kind of state control.

Such a position on the question of the role of the state in the field of education is defended by the well-known conservative Richard Butler, author of the education act of 1944, according to which the English school system now functions.

To the principle of defense by the state of the educational rights of parents and children, he contrasts the principle of the defense of the parents and children against state intervention in education.

Even in the United States, where formally the church is separated from the state and the school from the church, there is a decision of the Supreme Court to the effect that "the state does not have the jurisdiction to fix a single standard of education, and cannot require all children to study in the public (i.e., state -- M. B.) schools."

But limiting the right and jurisdiction of the state in

the field of education, the encyclical of the Vatican at the same time claims the "inalienable right to supervise the educational work of all educational institutions both private and public, and not only in the field of religious education but for every other branch of knowledge."

"Even physical culture," pathetically cries the encyclical, "does not lie outside the supervision of the church, since even physical culture can aid or hinder Christian education!"

With references to Saint Thomas the encyclical tries to base the priority of the family before that of the state in the matter of education, and calls these rights of the family inviolable, although it is generally recognized and accepted that capitalism has reduced to a minimum the educational opportunities of the family, inasmuch as it has attracted to production not only the head of the family -- the father, but also the mother and the older children. The corruption of the patriarchal family by capitalism, V. I. Lenin showed, of necessity takes on in modern society the most horrible, disastrous, and repulsive forms.

However, the Vatican continues to perceive in faithful parents its true ally in the struggle against state secular education.

The encyclical directly calls on the parents of Catholics to "refuse to send their children to such schools where there is danger of poisoning them with scepticism." The encyclical of Pius XI is convincing documentary evidence of the fact that the Catholic Church, by entangling all countries of the capitalist world with a thick network of educational institutions, is an anti-popular, anti-national force, openly undermining the very foundations of the system of public education.

The Individual Character of Bourgeois Educational Theories

Contrasting the individual to society, to the masses, emphasizing the "self-sufficing" and "holly value" of the individual, the bourgeois educational theories in all ways strive to protect the individual from the "leveling" and "destructive" influence of the masses. This individualistic fear of the masses was most openly stated in the nineteenth century by the Danish preacher and originator of existentialism, Søren Kierkegaard.

"To struggle against princes and popes," said he, "is easier than to struggle against the masses, against the tyranny of equality. No one can remain an individual if he does not guard against becoming one of the mass."

The spiritual father of existentialism is echoed by his contemporary supporter and disciple, the American professor Harper: "Truth is in the minority, and therefore the search for truth must be set apart from the opinion of the majority."

The individual is contrasted to the mass also by the representatives of personalist education, considering the individual the fundamental mover of progress, and the people an inert "driven mass."

They not only place the individual above the mass but consider the individual completely independent from the people, inasmuch, as in the teaching of these theoreticians, great people appear in accordance with "an aim inherently characteristic of the world"; and they consider the "cosmic individual" to be the original cause of progress.

"In a certain sense," says the representative of personalist education Herman Horn, "civilization creates individuals, but in a broader sense individuals create civilization. They are always in the front lines, they lead civilization along behind them... Of course they also lead the masses along behind them." From this, the aim of the school, according to Horn, is the "education of leaders and their followers..."

Such an interpretation of the problem of the interrelationship of the individual and society is anti-social and anti-scientific. There can be no talk of the freedom of the individual, of the freedom of his development and creative work in society, when the exploiting minority reigns over the exploited majority; when everything is bought and sold, including human abilities and talents, even human dignity; when the success of individuals is bought at the expense of the misery and poverty of hundreds and thousands of unfortunates.

The everyday experience of the countries of capitalism proves daily and hourly that regardless of any twaddle about the "holy" human personality, the personal dignity of man is trampled upon at every step, many individuals wither without having bloomed, thousands of talents fade and perish in obscurity without the chance to come to the fore.

As we are shown by the experience of the world's first socialist state of workers and peasants, the true development of the human personality, the complete blooming of the people's talents, have become possible and practical only after the destruction of the rule of man over man, only under the conditions of freedom for the broad masses of the people -- the creators of material and spiritual values.

Utilization of the School to Strengthen the Class Division of Society

The first and basic question of any educational theory is the question of the aims and tasks of education and the school. This question is usually taken in two aspects, to wit: what are the aims and tasks of the school with respect to the students? and secondly, what are the aims and tasks of the school with respect to society, especially, in the capitalist world, to a society torn by class antagonism?

At the end of the last century and even in the 1920s, especially in the period of so-called economic "prosperity", the bourgeois educational theorists openly defended the class division of society as preordained by the Most High. They considered as the basic task of the school the consolidation of these class distinctions by means of dividing school education into various channels: for the ruling minority -- through a privileged, practically closed system of Gymnasias, aristocratic schools, etc.; and for the huge majority of the children of the people -- through public schools which gave them only the most elementary knowledge of reading, writing, and arithmetic, a school from which the graduates went straight to the common labor market.

And so, at the end of the 1920s, the well-known companion-in-arms of John Dewey, the professor of education of the teachers' college of Columbia University, William Kilpatrick, showed in his public lectures on the general theme "What is the good life?" that society is arranged in layers, one on top of the other (the so-called "theory of the stratification of society" used by bourgeois sociologists instead of the theory of class division). But each individual, "as fate wills it," is biologically and socially placed in one of these layers, each layer being sufficiently broad and roomy to permit the individual full satisfaction, each being able and having to realize his opportunities within the limits of the layer reserved for him. For our personal "happiness," said Kilpatrick, there is no reason to separate ourselves from our

layer, for we might turn out to be unhappy or at least less happy than if we had stayed there.

This antidemocratic theory actually sanctified the two parallel school systems existing in the majority of capitalist countries: for the "chosen" and for the "people." This theory was strengthened by much research on so-called "scientific education," research based on the notorious "intelligence tests," according to which the workers' children were apparently incapable of serious mental work, the higher educational institutions consequently being closed to them.

The influence of the theory of stratification is found even now in some modern bourgeois educational theories. In particular, this theory lies at the basis of the requirements for the early teaching of trades in the mass public school.

For example, working during the last years of his life in the United States, the English philosopher and educational theorist Alfred Whitehead, wrote in his book The Aims of Education: "The man with a general education is the most useless and boring person on earth... I understand that it is a contradiction to recommend specialization of the program of study when the character of culture is continually expanding. Of course, without contradictions the world would be simpler, but probably stupider."

The partisans of early specialization in study proceed directly from the task of the school regarding the consolidation of the class division of society, the stabilization of the class barriers through early specialization and strict dosages of the educational ration for the children of the people. Such partisans would not only manage cheaply, but would make it difficult for the children of the workers to escape from the established class framework.

The School as a Means of "Smoothing Over" Class Contradictions

It is necessary, however, to note that alongside the theory of class stratification and the utilization of school for consolidating class differences, the opposite theory of utilization of the school for the reconciliation, "smoothing over," if not the complete liquidation, of class differences has received wide dissemination in bourgeois education of the twentieth century.

One of the first and most zealous partisans of this

point of view was the well-known philosopher and educational theorist, John Dewey.

"Democracy is making a big mistake," wrote Dewey at the beginning of our century, "if it permits society's division into classes to be strengthened. The difference in property, the existence of broad masses of unskilled workers, the spreading of scorn for physical labor, the difficulty of receiving an education in order to forge ahead -- all this leads to an increase in class contradictions."

And for the duration of his long theoretical education work, Dewey encouraged in every way the use of the school as a tool for softening these class contradictions. Dewey and his fellow-thinkers excelled especially in the dissemination of such illusions as the "peaceful liquidation of classes by means of education" in the years of deepest economic and ideological crisis, 1929-1938.

This idea of using the school as a tool for liquidating the class division of society was snatched up by opportunists and bourgeois reformists beginning in the second quarter of our century. It was just this idea which became the theoretical basis for the movement "for a single school," which spread in England, Germany, France, and Italy. The slogan of "the single school" was zealously defended by the "Union of Decisive School Reformers" in Germany, and the "Fraternity of New Education" in France. In England, the idea of using the school for smoothing over class differences is especially fervently put forth by the Laborites under the slogan of "equality of educational opportunities" or "secondary education for all."

The reformist essence of the movement for a single school was clearly expressed by the special commission on a single school created by the French cabinet of Herriot in 1924. "Such a reform of the school," wrote the commission then, "would aid the unity of the nation, would eliminate class distinctions, and, by offering equal educational opportunities, would permit the utilization of all the intellectual resources of France, wherever they may be located."

The Marxists -- the original defenders of the interests of the workers -- have struggled and continue to struggle both against the theory of using the school as a tool for consolidating the "stratification" of society, and against the theory of using the school with the aims of "destratifying" society. They disclose the assertion of the "eternity," "naturalness," and "predestination" of the class division of society; they

show its historical conditionality and transient character; they disclose the antiscientific and antipopular character of the assertions of the intellectual inferiority of the workers' children;; and they fight for the destruction of the exploiting class society, which will make it possible to liquidate class privileges in the field of education.

The limitation of the slogan "single school" under capitalism, the illusiveness of hopes for the school as a tool to liquidate class distinctions, were warned against at the beginning of our century by Klara Tsetkin in her paper on the school question at the Third Women's Conference in Bremen: I do not expect too much from the "single school," said K. Tsetkin. "Until there is a modern economic system, the rich classes will have the opportunity to add to the education of their children in the home. I wish merely to warn against excessive enthusiasm for the slogan "single school," as is everywhere seen with the bourgeois social reformers and teachers."

The demagogic fate of the slogan "single school" under capitalism was disclosed by the Communist Party of Germany in 1924 in its answer to a questionnaire from Paul Osterreich, chairman of the "Union of Decisive School Reformers", to all parties and candidates for deputy of the Reichstag, regarding their positions on questions of school policy and particularly on their attitude toward the demand of the single school. The Communist Party of Germany considered the demand for the single school only natural, for the revolutionary party, but it considered this demand insufficient. The single school demolishes only the group, but not the class advantages of the ruling classes in the field of education. The single school under capitalism, especially the secondary and higher school, remains a class school, both from the point of view of its entrance and from the point of view of its content and direction of teaching. The attempt to overcome the cultural schism of the people by reforming education is a reactionary utopia.

"Without recognizing the proletarian revolution," wrote the Communist Party of Germany, "the slogan of the single school hangs in the air and creates the illusion that it is possible, on the ground of a class society, to achieve a radical improvement in education."

It is not uninteresting to note that in connection with the approval by the second session of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR of the "Law on strengthening the link of the school with life and on the further development of the system of public

education in the USSR," according to which there will be created several types of secondary general-education schools, the bourgeois propaganda raised a racket, as if class distinctions in the field of education were being restored. The groundlessness and demagogic character of this ballyhoo are perfectly obvious to any literate person. It is an indisputable proposition that it is not the school system that determines the character and social structure of a society, but just the opposite: the character and social structure of a society determine the social nature and possibilities of the school.

In his "Pearls of Populist Hare-Brained Schemes" written in 1897, V. I. Lenin persuasively showed that the group school requires of the student that he belong to a certain group. The class school knows no groups; it knows only citizens. It requires from all students just one thing: That they pay for their education" (V. I. Lenin, Soch., Vol. 2, p. 432.)

"But it is precisely because in a class society education is equally organized and equally available to all the wealthy, because the single school, the so-called single educational ladder, does not cease to be a class school, that "those who have no funds to pay for education, textbooks, school expenses for the whole educational period,-- such are simply not admitted by the class school to secondary education" (V. I. Lenin, Soch., Vol. 2, p. 432).

In a society where education is bought and sold there can be no true equality of educational opportunities for the wealthy and the poor, for the exploiters and the exploited. On the other hand, in the Soviet Union, where the very possibility of exploitation of man by man has been forever destroyed, where the possibility of the revival of the exploiting classes has been excluded by the social structure, the presence of different types of secondary schools does not and cannot threaten us with the re-establishment of class distinctions.

Not one of these types of secondary schools gives the students any kind of political or economic privileges. Upon graduation they all pour into the common family of Soviet Workers who live by their labor and whose personal well-being is organically connected with the well-being of the whole Soviet nation.

The Myth of Transforming Society through Education

In capitalist countries the overwhelming majority of workers' families cannot carry the burden of expenses connected with the long education of their children, the expenses needed to complete even secondary education. This leads to the appearance of a whole army of neglected youths who are incited by need to various kinds of violations of the bourgeois law and order.

Neither can young people engage in productive work. The transition of capitalist production from extensive to intensive methods of exploitation has led to the relative exclusion of the labor of youths from industry. In the book (Equal Educational Opportunities for Youth, Edward Newton notes that in the past 60 years the number of youths working in industry has decreased 3 times. As a result, the children of workers go directly from their school desks to the ranks of the unemployed.

In the search for a solution to this burning social problem, the bourgeois state has been forced to raise the required school age. During our century the ages of compulsory school attendance has been raised by law to 14-15 years in many European countries and even to 16-18 years in several states of the USA.

However, it would be a serious mistake to think that this increase in the required school age has been dictated by the concern of the bourgeois state over the educational needs of the broad masses. It has been provoked first and foremost by the bourgeoisie's efforts to keep the children of the workers under their ideological influence and control.

This increase in the mandatory school age is, on the other hand, a forced concession on the part of the bourgeoisie to the demands of organized labor, which sees in this measure not so much a pedagogical means as an economic means to keep considerable numbers of young workers out of the labor market, as a rather indirect and artificial means in the struggle against unemployment.

The real aims pursued by the bourgeoisie in raising the mandatory school age were frankly stated by one of the leaders of the Conservative Party of Great Britain, Richard Butler, the author of the education bill of 1944, according to which the school system of England operates. Fighting for the raising of the mandatory school age to 15 years, Butler asserted, "Youths

of 14 years are more virtuous when they are school than when they are out of school."

It is also an error to think that raising the required school age automatically leads to an increase in the level of education of the students who stay longer in school. This is shown not only by the experience of Great Britain, where the majority of students held back for an additional year actually continue to stay until 15 in the same elementary, so-called "all-ages" schools, where one teacher teaches all academic subjects, or in the so-called "modern" secondary schools, which are frequently the same elementary schools under another name.

Frequently the additional year of education turns into a waste of time, with a corrupting influence not only on the students but on some teachers. The many complaints of English parents and the students themselves show that raising the required school age is far from always justified from the point of view of raising the level of education for many English youths. This additional year is turned, in essence, into forced time-serving.

This is shown also by the experience of the US, where in certain states the students remain in school for 12 years. In spite of such a long term of schooling, the more able American educators admit that the level of education received by American students in 12 years is at least 2 years behind the level of education given in the best secondary schools of several Western European countries in 10 years of study.

All these facts are conclusive proof that the broadening of public education and the longer school term for the main mass of children, which have taken place in the more developed, both economically and industrially, capitalist countries during our century, have stemmed not from the interests of the exploited classes but from the interests of the very bourgeoisie.

Meanwhile, bourgeois educational theorists, as well as bourgeois propaganda, try in every way to use these facts not only to emphasize and praise the "success" of the bourgeois state in public education. From the fact of the raising of compulsory school age and the broadening of the numbers of children attending school, the bourgeois educational theorists are trying to make far-fetched conclusions, striving to instill in the working masses the idea that education is the "only hope" for their achieving not only cultural but social and economic freedom.

The idea of the peaceful transformation of society by means of universal education runs through all the writings of John Dewey, the American educational theorist, and all his many fellow-thinkers. It is the very foundation of all their educational philosophy, as well as that of their "philosophy of life."

This idea was especially earnestly prpaganized by them in the years of crisis for the bourgeoisie, 1929-33. One of the noisiest disciples of Dewey, who recently created for himself unenviable "glory" by his malignant and slanderous attacks on Soviet education, Professor George Counts, put out in those years a special brochure with the demagogic title "Does the School Dare to Build a New Social Order?" In this brochure Counts seriously attempted to present himself in the role of savior to the broad masses of American people thrown off the track of life by the deep economic and ideological shocks of those years, by trying to convince them that it was he and his fellow-thinkers who had the "secret" of curing the social organism of the US.

All the later work of Counts, especially his last educational-theory works, in which he breathlessly praises the notorious "American way of life," once again showed that his sensational brochure of the 1930s was nothing more than an ideological maneuver. Counts tried to save the capitalist system so dear to his heart by turning the dissatisfaction, anger, and despair of the popular masses of the US into the peaceful stream of "gradual reconstruction" of society through education.

The idea of "transforming society through education" was taken also as armament by all forms of opportunism and revisionism, which are the secret service of the bourgeoisie in the working class. Characteristic of all forms of opportunism is unbelief in the creative powers of the working class, unbelief in its ability to build with its own strength a new social structure, to create a new culture higher than that of the bourgeoisie. From this stems their demand that the working class come to the bourgeoisie for training. From this stems the notorious counterrevolutionary slogan: "First education and then reforms." This same concept, as is well known, was also adhered to by the Russian Mensheviks, with the difference that they did not believe not only in the strength of the Russian working class, but also in the strength of the whole Russian people, whom they tried to talk into studying under the "advanced" Western civilization.

Disclosing this antipatriotic bourgeois lie, V. I. Lenin wrote about the notes of the Menshevik Sukhanov:

"If to create socialism a certain level of culture is required (although no one can say exactly what this certain 'level of culture' is, for it is different in each of the Western European states), then why may we not begin by winning by revolutionary means the prerequisites for this certain level, and then, on the basis of the power of the workers and peasants and the Soviet structure, move to overtake other peoples?" (V. I. Lenin, Soch., Vol. 33, p. 438).

The reformist slogan of transforming society through education is not only illusory but treacherous under capitalist conditions. With their actual monopoly of education, the bourgeoisie would have the full opportunity to delay its rule over the broad masses of workers.

The Role of the School in Creating a Workers' Aristocracy

One of the most characteristic peculiarities of the imperialist stage of development of capitalism is the isolation from the ranks of the working class of a small privileged stratum of the "workers' aristocracy."

"Imperialism," V. I. Lenin showed, "had a tendency even among the workers to isolate privileged groups and to split them off from the broad mass of the proletariat" (V. I. Lenin, Soch., Vol 22, p. 270).

The colonial superprofit received by the imperialist states allowed the bourgeoisie of these countries to bribe this workers' aristocracy by the most varied methods.

"...the whole business comes right down to bribery," said V. I. Lenin at the Second Congress of the Communist International. "This is done in thousands of various ways: raising culture in the larger centers, creating educational institutions, creating thousands of soft jobs for the leaders of cooperatives, for the leaders of trade unions, for leaders of parliament" (V. I. Lenin, Soch., Vol. 31, p. 206.)

Among the many forms of bribery of the workers' aristocracy, one of the more important is the broadening of educational opportunities for the children of this privileged section of the workers, offering their children a certain number of free, so-called "special places" in privileged secondary

schools, offering the more capable of these children a certain number of state or charitable scholarships which make it possible for them to finish their secondary, and in some cases higher, education.

Bourgeois educational theorists, and especially the opportunists, try to have this fact pass for "convincing" proof of the gradual smoothing over, and, in the future, complete liquidation, of class distinctions.

This idyllic picture of such unity of the bourgeois nation was ridiculed by the French writer Anatole France in his novel Life in Flower: "The same education for all, for rich and poor. All go through the elementary school. Anyone who shows higher capabilities is admitted to the secondary school, at whose benches will be seated the bourgeois and proletarian elite. From this united elite will grow the elite of the higher school of science and art."

In principle, the mistakenness of this type of reasoning was shown by V. I. Lenin more than half a century ago: "...as opposed to the groups," he wrote, "the classes always leave completely free the transfer of individuals from one class to another" (V. I. Lenin, Soch., Vol. 2, p.432).

The transfer of part of the workers' aristocracy admitted to the privileged schools into the ranks of the bourgeois intelligentsia, and then into the ranks of the bourgeoisie itself, hardly liquidates the class structure of the capitalist society, but rather only strengthens the class position of the bourgeoisie.

There is an interesting comment on this by the head of the department of education of the National Coal Directorate of England, R. Rivance: "Within the working class," he writes, "there is already felt a fear that the broadening of the universities that we have seen in recent years may be a silent strengthening of the bosses, in spite of the fact that it was achieved by means of their democratization."

But the hopes of the opportunists for the liquidation of class distinctions by broadening the access for children of the workers to the privileged schools of higher degrees in no way is supported by the actual state of affairs. The practice of allotting special places for students who have completed public school received wide dissemination in England, especially after the so-called educational reform of 1944.

The data on this question are noted in the collective

research of Flood, Halsey, and Martin, Social Classes and Educational Opportunities, published in 1955, i.e., 11 years after the English Parliament adopted the education bill of 1944.

The editor of this work, Jan Flood, makes the following resume of the research: "In the years 1931-41 (i.e., before the war and before the reforms -- M. B.) about 10% of the children of workers who had attained 11 years of age entered the privileged (selected) secondary schools.

"In the 1952-53 academic year, i.e., 5 years after the introduction of the act of 1944, a check of two comparable but contrasting city regions in the north and south of England showed that this percentage wavers between 12 and 15, falling lower in the regions with a predominant working population.

"Although there are now more workers' children than before who attend grammar school, the probability or chance of their hitting there is little different from that up to 1945."

As the same research shows, the probability of getting into grammar school is almost twice as small for the children of unskilled workers, in comparison with the children of skilled workers, and from 2.5-3 times as small by comparison with the children of the workers' aristocracy.

It is also necessary to emphasize that admission to the privileged secondary school for the children of workers certainly does not indicate that they will finish this school.

As the account of the Education Council of England shows, of 12% of the children of unskilled workers studying in the full secondary school, only 1.5% get as far as the sixth form, or last grade. In other words, the majority of the children of the simple workers of England who are admitted to the full secondary school give up their studies before they finish.

The offer, for the more capable children from among the working people, of a certain number of "special places" in the privileged secondary and higher educational institutions is least of all called for by the concern of the bourgeoisie for the educational interests of the workers or its "thirst" for liquidating class distinctions.

Thus the bourgeoisie tries to solve the following problems:

1. To broaden the contingent of the so-called "intell-

ectual elite," or more simply, the bourgeois intelligentsia, inasmuch as under the more and more complex conditions of modern industrial and business life the bourgeois cannot with its own forces occupy all posts requiring a fair level of mental development and special knowledge.

2. By this means the bourgeoisie tries to "skim the cream" from the public school and thus attract to its own side the more capable representatives of the working class, thus lessening the quantity of potential directors and organizers of the struggle of the working class for its social emancipation. The bourgeoisie strives to use these "happified" pupils from among the working people in the capacity of a secret service in the working class, pushing the working masses onto the path of opportunism and conciliation.

This danger of intellectual robbery of the working class and of corruption of those who are workers by birth, which conceals within itself the drawing in of part of the more capable children of the workers to the privileged bourgeois schools, was pointed out as early as the beginning of our century by that ardent fighter for the workers' cause, Klara Tsetkin. In her public lecture on the school question, read by K. Tsetkin at the Conference of German Women in 1908, she said: "The capable son of the people, drawn by the thirst for knowledge along a steep path to the Eden of education, at whose gates the wealthy have set a guardian angel with a fiery sword, should not be dommed to the thorny, rocky path of alms and gifts.

"Scholarships are given only to a small number who are far from always the most capable and worthy. This system of charity saps ability, promote superficial discipline, spoils character, creates lazy hirelings with the soul of a slave, instead of able thinkers. In the final analysis, this system has as its aim the education of obedient spiritual guardians of the bourgeois society."

The same spirit is expressed now by many English and American progressive educators.

Hughes, the former secretary of the first Labor Ministry of Education, speaks out categorically against this "selective" policy: "Sending to the independent schools a certain number of experimental guinea pigs at public expense only cajoles the social conscience of these institutions and gives them a pseudodemocratic character, while increasing their resources."

Interesting thoughts on this subject are spoken by the American author F. Landberg:

"At Harvard and Yale (the more "aristocratic" private higher educational institutions of the US -- M. B.) one can meet the son of a miner or a farmer, although this happens rather rarely.

"However, the task of Harvard and Yale is to fashion out of these capable young people spineless servants of the ruling classes -- lawyers, corporation and municipal workers, stockbrokers, bankers, priests.

"Not one of these universities, in its academic programs, shows interest in the problems of any other class except the rich."

The children of workers, "happified" by a scholarship and a place in the privileged bourgeois schools of higher level, frequently not only lose their individuality, forget their background, but often leave there as potential traitors to the interests of their own class.

The School as a Tool of Bourgeois Influence on Workers' Children

Modern bourgeois educational theories have introduced something "new" into the question of the tasks of the school with respect to the students. This "new" thing is expressed first of all in the transfer of the emphasis of the work of the school from teaching to so-called "character building."

This proposition was most expressively formulated by the "ideologist" of Neo-Thomist education, William MacGoken: "Not information, but formation, more accurately, transformation into a Catholic -- this is the central task of the school." Thus it is said here that not education, but religious upbringing, is the main thing in the work of the bourgeois school.

The earlier-mentioned representative of existentialism in education, John Wilde, considers the central task of the school to be the "arming of the students with ideology," bourgeois, of course. The representatives of personalist education consider the task of the school to be the "education of leaders and their followers."

According to the data of one of the more active educators -- professor of the teachers' college of Columbia Univer-

sity, Goodwin Watson, the quantity of articles and books devoted to the problem of study and formation of character published yearly in bourgeois countries has grown in the past decade several dozen times and is measured now not in hundreds, but in thousands.

It is not by accident that in this "stylish" movement first violin is played and the basic tone set by all sorts of religious organizations and their daughter organizations, such as the "Christian unions of youth" and various "philanthropic" organizations. The religionists strive to convince the teachers that "without religion there can be no true education of character."

All this shows that we deal here not with something accidental and transient, but with a phenomenon typical of imperialism. This interest in the "formation of the character" of a person is directly connected with the class interests of the modern imperialist bourgeoisie.

The great successes of the workers of the Soviet Union and other countries freed from the yoke of capitalism give to the workers of the capitalist countries additional strength and faith in their struggle against the exploiters. The growth of class consciousness and political resistance of the workers plants fear in the hearts of the exploiters.

With the aim of struggling against the proletarian ideology, against the attractive force of the example of the Soviet Union, the bourgeoisie, along with other levers of their propaganda, strive to exploit the "upbringing" work of the school.

The bourgeoisie strives to get from the mass school "obedient," "meek," "trustworthy," "respectable," "loyal" graduates who respect private property, and submit to the bourgeois laws, -- placid executors of the will of their masters. In other words, monopolistic capital encroaches not only on the muscle and nerves of the workers, but on their souls.

But this is only one side of the matter.

Alongside the problem of the ideological conquering of the masses, there stands before the bourgeoisie still of the masses, there stands before the bourgeoisie still another task -- the training of political, business, and ideological "leaders." Under the conditions of ever-sharpening class contradictions and class battles, the monopolists need "brave," "enterprising" servants, devoted to the bourgeois interests not

through fear but through conscience. Through a complex network of privileged schools, through the Boy Scout semimilitary youth organizations, the children's political organizations, the bourgeoisie prepares its "elite."

Building the characters of these future leaders is naturally an important facet of the bourgeois educational system intended for the chosen minority.

The Struggle Against Science, Against Arming the Workers with Scientific Knowledge

The "newest" bourgeois educational theories not only put the upbringing tasks of the school in first place in comparison with its academic tasks, but in general consider the arming of the students with knowledge to be the last task of the school.

The Neo-Thomist MacGoken emphasizes that "the church considers religion more important than the knowledge of fractions," "a good moral upbringing more important than grammatical ability," and "the upbringing of a good Catholic more important than teaching the value of a creation of Shakespeare." This Neo-Thomist is echoed by the representative of existentialist education, Professor Harper: "No one need expect that existentialism will start to emphasize a special knowledge of mathematics." And in another place Harper writes: "No one (?) now thinks that the steps of education leading to college should be reduced to mathematics, languages, to the actual study of literature and history." Such a position is supported by the representatives of personalist education. The above-mentioned Herman Horn emphasizes that what is important is not what is taught, but who teaches, that "it is dangerous to teach the students that which is" (i.e., the knowledge of objective reality -- M. B.).

The "outstanding" representative of pragmatic education, William Kilpatrick, also gives a developed program of curtailing the quantity and content of education in the mass American school. In the book Upbringing in a Changing Civilization W. Kilpatrick, pathetically crying, "Free the school from the dead weight!", sets forth these ways to attain his slogan: For the majority of students one can exclude a considerable part of mathematics. The greater part of world history should give way to the study of social problems. The study of foreign languages is hardly necessary for the majority of those who study them.

In another place in the same book, Kilpatrick emphasizes that the academic program cannot be determined beforehand. "Having a previously determined subject content for the academic course equally binds both teacher and pupil." Professor Kilpatrick, as is known, was one of the main inspirers of hare-brained schemes concerning methods, specifically the "method of projects" which provides the students with neither stable nor systematic learning.

All the newest bourgeois educational theories are alike in their negative approach to science.

The Neo-Thomists treat science as the "lowest source of knowledge, and contrast to it "divine revelation" as the highest source. They strive to turn science into a servant of theology, they require from it proofs of the existence of God, the wisdom of the religious Weltanschauung. The existentialists also rebel against the "dictatorship" of science. They reject the existence of objective truths. "Truth comes not from without," said Kierkegaard, "but from within." "Truth lies in the crevices of the brain," echoes Professor Harper, his modern fellow-thinker.

Karl Jaspers, the more reactionary representative of German existentialism, strives to turn the masses away from science by teaching unbelief in it. "Scientific thought," he writes in his extensive composition, "On Truth," in which there is not a grain of truth, "disturbs existence." "It is not only does not give existence support in the true view, but makes it still more unsure and unhappy." Existentialist Jaspers is echoed by pragmatist Kilpatrick. "Modern science," wrote he in his Reconstruction of the Theory of the Pedagogical Process, "shows that cause-and-effect regularity is not so exact, but is rather only a statistical mean. Science notwithstanding, or better, thanks to science (?! --- M. B.), the future becomes even more uncertain in all large directions."

Herman Horn, the "ideologist" of the personalist school, states that the task of the school is to convince the students to guide themselves not by causes and effects, but by goals, i.e., not by scientifically established laws of objective reality, but by teleology (see Note).

(Note: Teleology is an idealist teaching, according to which everything in nature is organized expediently. F. Engels is ridiculed the view of the teleologists, that "cats were created to eat mice, and mice to be eaten by cats, and all nature to show the wisdom of the creator.")

In the achievements of science, especially in the knowledge of the laws of social development made possible by the studies of Marx and Lenin, the bourgeois theorists instinctively perceive a deadly danger for the capitalist world so dear to their hearts; they see the threat of the liberation of the masses from their ideological influence and control.

The policy of the educational starvation ration for the workers, stubbornly carried out by the monopolistic bourgeoisie of the leading capitalist countries, which "substantiate" and sanctify the bourgeois educational theories, contradicts not only the educational interests of the broad masses of the people, but also brings about a sharp collision with the requirements of modern society as a whole, especially with the requirements of modern production, ever more permeated with science. This policy of the monopolistic bourgeoisie has led to a crisis in the school education of the leading capitalist countries, a crisis whose depth began to be obvious in the years of the Second World War, and especially in recent years in the light of the success, of world-wide historical importance, of Soviet science and Soviet education.

Because of space limitations we shall cite only a few data on the school crisis in the US and in England. Here is what was written in 1956 on the condition of the American secondary school by the well-known professor of education Isaak Kendle, who has long been occupied with a comparative study of the state of secondary education in the leading countries of the world:

"American education, especially secondary education, has long undergone criticism of its cult of antiintellectualism. This criticism is to a considerable degree justified, as is shown by a serious analysis of the 300 courses offered by the secondary schools of the US" (see Note).

(Note: Up to the present, in the secondary schools of the US there has been applied the so-called "elective system," in accordance with which the students themselves choose a large part of their subjects.)

There has been a change from the traditional academic studies to more practical and functional studies without the slightest pedagogical justification for it. Even when the school offers the traditional academic subjects, they are studied on the average for not more than 2 years, i.e., a period completely insufficient to provide for the mastery of at least the fundamentals of each scientific discipline. As a

result of such study there is even less intellectual or cultural progress.

Professor Kendle reproduces part of the statement of Doctor Donning of Columbia University, printed in the New York Times of 8 December 1956, to the effect that "not one American secondary school offers even half the requirements in mathematics, physics, and chemistry that are offered by the Russian school."

"This comparison," adds Professor Kendle, "however stunning, is not unexpected to the specialists in comparative education, who have long known that the programs in these subjects which are in effect in the secondary schools of many foreign states are considerably higher than the American programs. Moreover, it has been the practice for the past half century to admit the graduates of European secondary schools to the second year of American colleges."

The crisis in American education has in recent years taken on such proportions and become so obvious that it was necessary for prominent government officials of the US, including President Eisenhower himself, to speak of it. In recent years there has been in the White House -- the President's residence -- a series of conferences on questions of education, which shows the serious concern of the government regarding the states of public education in the country. Throughout the country there are conferences of the representatives of education and business circles to search for ways and means of liquidating or at least softening the crisis in the American school.

The problem of public education is recognized now in the US as "problem number one," i.e., having the greatest actual social significance. The slogan of the US has become "catch up with the USSR in the field of science and education."

Of course, neither the government officials of the US nor the bourgeois educational theorists, including the above-mentioned Professor Kendle, are about to disclose the real reasons for this deep crisis, which has cut into the age-old educational policies of the American bourgeoisie. From this point of view, of more interest and greater scientific value are the statements of the prominent English physicist and social worker, Professor John Bernal, regarding the crisis of English education and its causes. On the basis of much factual material and with full knowledge of the matter, Professor Bernal shows that the crisis in English education is a direct result of the educational policies of the ruling classes of England, which

have placed their narrow class interests above the national interests of their country.

Science, as we know, continues to penetrate more and more into modern production technology. The mastery of intranuclear energy and its industrial utilization, the introduction of automatization and cybernetics into an ever greater number of branches of industry, the discovery of antibiotics and semiconductors -- these are only some of the main trends in modern production technology, which have become possible thanks to the ever-growing application of science to production.

We must also take into consideration, according to Professor Bernal, that even atomic plants and automatic production lines are only in the beginning stage of development, and that therefore it is especially important that all workers connected with this technology have sufficient technical and scientific training not only to direct the new technology, but also to master its relevant tasks and to devise means of perfecting it, for only the people working at these new plants can most effectively determine which improvements should be made and the way these should be effected.

Consequently, the new technology requires first of all a raising of the technical and scientific level of all workers; it makes new demands on education at all its levels. But it is just this that is not desired, it is this that is most of all feared, by the ruling classes of England. "The heads of state, the directors of industrial monopolies and financial concerns, fear the consequences of graduating a large number of scientists." Highly educated, especially scientifically educated people, emphasizes Professor Bernal, are dangerous for the capitalist system.

"Such a cultural advance of the working class not only would greatly strengthen the business position of the workers in their relations with the bourgeoisie, but would lead to a situation in which more and more workers would be convinced of the uselessness and backward nature of the modern economic system of England."

More and more workers would discover the basic fact that modern technology has reached an irreconcilable clash with private possession of the means of production, and they would come to the conclusion that the changes brought about by modern technology in the productive forces demand corresponding changes in production relations.

The basic principle of the management of industry under capitalism. Professor Bernal shows, boils down to the fact that the managing positions must be in the hands of people who by birth, by family connections, or by their interests, are the trusted supporters of the capitalist system. In the past the observance of this principle was possible so long as the group of managers remained small.

Now, however, the development of science has reached such proportions that it can no longer be limited by one chosen "elite," but inevitably takes in the whole population.

Under these conditions, write Professor Bernal, the bourgeoisie faces a double threat.

Firstly, a large number of scientifically and technically competent people must be admitted to positions which are de facto controlling positions, while this admission will come with such speed and in such proportions that it will be hard to assimilate them.

The second threat, even more serious, is that the raising of the scientific and technical level of the majority of the working class will become absolutely necessary so that industry, built on a scientific base, may work efficiently.

The English bourgeoisie is placed by the objective march of events before a very difficult choice: either greatly broaden scientific education for all, at the same time giving up its monopoly on education, and thus giving up the main condition of its social superiority; or to go against the current, against the progressive trends of the new technology, thus risking economic grief for the country and the loss of their own wealth.

Taking into consideration the past line of action of the English bourgeoisie, concludes Professor Bernal, it is not difficult to foresee the direction it will take in solving the problems before it. It will stubbornly ignore the true situation, and try to avoid a radical choice by making gestures in the direction of the scientific and technical revolution, gestures which will be too weak and too late to be effective.

"Neither the conservatives nor the right-wing laborites will willingly transform the English system of public education."

In other words, the contradiction between the requirements of production and the limited dose of natural-science

education which the bourgeoisie considers it possible to give to the workers' children is one of the radical contradictions that the bourgeoisie has no strength to decide, and this contradiction undoubtedly will have great significance for the future fate of capitalism as a whole.

In the light of this deep analysis of the educational policies of the English bourgeoisie by Professor Bernal, which retains its meaning also with respect to the bourgeoisie of other leading capitalist countries, the reactionary essence of modern bourgeois educational theories becomes especially evident, theories which are against science and its regularity, and which fight in every possible way to decrease the quantity of natural-science studies given by the bourgeois school to the mass of workers' children.

In mortal fear of a working class which is striving for knowledge, the bourgeois educational theorists objectively push capitalism onto a path which more and more sharpens this radical contradiction of modern capitalism.

Two Cultures in Class Society, Two Lines in Education

It would be, however, incorrect to think that the critically described bourgeois educational theories exercise complete sway in the capitalist countries. These theories are not shared by ideologists of the strata of the bourgeoisie who bear the ever more ponderous yoke of the large financial and industrial monopolies. Neither are these theories shared by various representatives of the petty bourgeoisie, the bourgeois intelligentsia, a considerable part of which is itself the object of exploitation by the large bourgeois bosses. These theories are not acceptable to the democratic segment of the teachers of these countries who conscientiously fulfill their social and noble role in teaching and bringing up the younger generations, who stand close to the people(s masses, to their needs and requests.

The dissatisfaction of the more realistically attuned and far-seeing part of the bourgeoisie with the backward character of the "newest" educational theories is beginning to come more and more to the surface in such countries as the US, where reactionary trends in both politics and ideology are most clearly expressed.

In this respect a symptomatic discussion has been carried on for the past 3 years in the pages of the special journal

Educational Theory, published in the United States of America. The discussion is on the question of "liberating education from philosophy," or as its originators say, of creating "an autonomous educational theory."

The originator of this discussion, Professor Murray, expresses the disappointment, which is constantly spreading through the scientific-educational circles of the US, with the fruitlessness, isolation from the educational practice, and disoriented contradiction of the "newest" "philosophy of education." Murray emphasizes that education has its own specific needs and tasks, its subject and method, its rules and laws, and on this basis he demands the "liquidation" of the dependence of education on philosophy.

Of course, the rejection of the importance of philosophy for education, in its turn, is a form of philosophy, and the position of the partisans of "emancipation of education" seems to us very naive. But we cannot but see in this form of "rebellion" of education against the "newest" philosophers a healthy protest and desire to seek a more stable and rational base for the scientific solution of educational problems.

In evaluating the situation on the theoretical front of education in the leading capitalist countries, it is necessary to constantly bear in mind the principal indication of V. I. Lenin on the presence of two cultures in each national culture of a class society.

"In each national culture there are, though perhaps not developed, elements of democratic and socialist culture, for in each nation there is a working and an exploiting mass, the conditions of life of which inevitably give birth to the democratic and socialist ideology; but in each nation there is also a bourgeois culture (and, still in the majority, Black Hundreds and clerics) -- not only in the form of "elements," but in the form of a ruling culture" (V. I. Lenin, Soch. Vol. 20, p. 8).

Disclosing all that is reactionary and dying in bourgeois culture and bourgeois education, we must constantly bear in mind that in all bourgeois countries there are also progressive, up-and-coming, democratic elements.

There are also progressive elements in the field of education in the capitalist countries. It is sufficient to call to mind the stubborn struggle of the democratic elements of France against the clerical encroachment on the state school and the state purse; the struggle of the English democratic

society and the democratic teachers against the privileged and private schools, against the sorting of children according to so-called "mental gifts" which is in essence a disguised form of class discrimination; the protests of the American teachers' and parents' societies against the Black Hundred laws forbidding Communists and their "fellow-travelers," i.e., all progressive teachers, to teach in the American educational institutions.

The members of the Communist Party have been and are the most consistent and steadfast fighters for the educational interests of the workers in all these countries. It is sufficient to name the late Professor Langevine and his deputy, Professor Ballon, the author of the postwar project of democratic reforms of education in France; comrades Conieau and Gardodi, who bravely exposed from the rostrum of the French parliament and in the press all the intrigues of the clerical and bourgeois reaction against the educational rights of the workers; Professor Bernal and the educator Simon in England. In the United States of America, where the Communist Party is in essence placed in the position of being subjected to continuous shadowing and investigation on the part of the intelligence organs of Edgar Hoover, and where all progressive elements are banished from the educational institutions, "many students are turning to Marxism," as is shown by the above-mentioned quote from the ideologist of existentialism, John Wilde.

In the peaceful competition between socialism and capitalism, there can be no doubt but that as the advantages of the socialist system of relations are more and more clearly drawn, a greater and greater number of the foreign intelligentsia of the bourgeois countries, including the teachers, will more frequently and in greater numbers turn to Marxism-Leninism. This process, which expresses the basic law of our century, cannot be stopped by any of the "newest" bourgeois theories, including educational theories, regardless of the abstract use names masking their stale ideological goods.

An exceptional role in the further attraction of the attention and sympathies of progressive people throughout the whole world as regards Soviet education and Marxist-Leninist teachings, will undoubtedly be played by the "Law on Strengthening the Ties between School and Life, and on the Further Development of the System of Public Education in the USSR," adopted 24 December 1958 by the session of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR.

This law has great theoretical and practical importance. Its realization will represent a great step on the path of turn-

ing the school into a tool for the destruction of the division of society into classes. This task is, as we know, a programmed requirement of the Communist Party, whose realization began with the first days of the Great October Revolution. It has its fullest and most consistent solution received in the law of 1958, which points out specific paths for "educating a new man in whom spiritual wealth, moral purity, and physical perfection will be harmoniously combined."

The basic meaning of the law of 24 December 1958 is that it consistently and decisively realizes the Marxist-Leninist proposition on the necessity for combining mental and physical labor for all children and youths without exception. The fulfillment of the law on relating the school to life is important step on the road to liquidating the distinctions between those who do mental and those who do physical work, on the road to educating that many-sided and harmoniously developed man of whom the best minds have dreamed for centuries.

Moreover, this will be an invaluable contribution of the Soviet people to the common treasury of educational theory and pedagogical science, and also the best practical disproof of the "newest" antipopular bourgeois educational theories.

5190

END